

REMARKS

Drawings

Applicant submits herewith formal drawings to overcome the Examiner's objection to the drawings.

Claim Rejections

The present application has been amended in response to the Examiner's Office Action to place the application in condition for allowance. Applicant, by the amendments presented above, has made a concerted effort to present claims which clearly define over the prior art of record, and thus to place this case in condition for allowance.

In the Office Action, the Examiner indicated that claim 9 would be allowable if re-written in independent form. Claim 8 has been amended such that it corresponds to original claim 9, re-written in independent form. Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 8, as well as those claims which depend therefrom, are allowable. Claim 1 has been similarly amended, but is directed to an apparatus. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1, and those claims which depend therefrom, are allowable.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected the remaining claims citing Aipperspach et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,205,063). Applicant respectfully submits that at least some of the claims which depend from claim 1 are further distinguishable from that which is disclosed in Aipperspach et al.

Claim 2 specifically claims that the memories are serially connected to the fuse controller. This is not disclosed or suggested by Aipperspach et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,205,063) which discloses a plurality of memories, each of which is connected directly to the fuse controller, as opposed to being serially connected. Claim 3 specifically claims that the fuse blocks are serially connected to the fuse controller. This is not disclosed or suggested by Aipperspach et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,205,063) which merely discloses a fuse circuit, and does not disclose or suggest providing that the fuse blocks are serially connected. Claim 4 specifically claims that both the memories and the fuse blocks are serially connected to the fuse controller.

Several new claims – claims 13 through 25 – have been added, and Applicant respectfully submits that the newly added claims are allowable.

Claim 13 specifically claims that the memories are configured in a serial chain, wherein one of the memories is connected to the fuse controller and the other memories are serially connected to each other and to the memory which is connected to the fuse controller. This is not disclosed or suggested by Aipperspach et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,205,063) which discloses a plurality of memories, each of which is connected directly to the fuse controller, and none of which are connected to each other. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 13, and those claims which depend therefrom, are allowable. Claim 19 is similar to claim 13, but is directed to a method. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 19, and those claims which depend therefrom, are also allowable.

Applicant respectfully submits that at least some of the dependent claims are further distinguishable from that which is disclosed in Aipperspach et al.

Claim 14 specifically claims that the fuse blocks are configured in a serial chain, wherein one of the fuse blocks is connected to the fuse controller and the other fuse blocks are serially connected to each other and to the fuse block which is connected to the fuse controller. This is not disclosed or suggested by Aipperspach et al. which merely discloses a fuse circuit, and does not disclose or suggest providing fuse blocks configured in a serial chain. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 14 is allowable, as is claim 20 which is similar to claim 14, but is directed to a method.

Claim 15 specifically claims that there are more memories than fuse blocks. Aipperspach et al. does not disclose or suggest providing as such, and only discloses a fuse circuit without describing that the fuse circuit includes less fuse blocks than there are memories. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 15 is allowable, as is claim 21 which is similar to claim 15, but is directed to a method.


Claim 18 specifically claims that the BISR scheme is configured to perform a wafer sort. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 18 is patentable for at least the same reasons why the Examiner indicated that original claim 9 would be allowable. Applicant also respectfully submits that claim 21 which is similar to claim 18, but is directed to a method, is also allowable.

In view of the above amendments, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims of the application are allowable over the rejections of the Examiner. Should the present claims not be deemed adequate to effectively define the patentable subject matter, the Examiner is respectfully urged to call the undersigned attorney of record to discuss the claims in an effort to reach an agreement toward allowance of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 6, 2004

By: _____


James R. Foley, Reg. No. 39,979
Attorney for Applicant
TREXLER, BUSHNELL, GIANGIORGI,
BLACKSTONE & MARR, LTD.
105 West Adams Street, 36th Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60603-6299
Tel: (312) 704-1890

639900.WPD